

Serial No. 10/692,331

Docket No. 65783-0031

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

In response to the Examiner's objection, and in accordance with the telephonic interview granted by the Examiner on June 20, 2006, the attached sheets of drawings include further detail of a first set of relays 300 and a second set of relays 310 according to an embodiment. Figure 2 and Figure 3 of the attached sheets replace Figure 2 and Figure 3 as originally filed.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

Serial No. 10/692,331

Docket No. 65783-0031

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Office Action mailed March 22, 2006, and thanks Examiner Cavallari for the detailed review of the pending claims. Applicants acknowledge and thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 17-19 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant also wishes to thank Examiner Cavallari for the telephonic interview granted on June 20, 2006 to discuss the Examiner's objections to the drawings. In response to the Office Action, Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 12, 13, 17, 18, 20, 22, and 25. By way of this amendment, no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-25 remain pending in this application. At least for the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully traverses the foregoing rejections. Further, Applicant believes that there are also reasons other than those set forth below why the pending claims are patentable, and reserves the right to set forth those reasons, and to argue for the patentability of claims not explicitly addressed herein, in future papers. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the above amendment, the new claims, and the following remarks.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the references disclosed in the information disclosure statement submitted 10/23/03.

Drawings

The drawings were objected to because they fail to show the connection of the first and second sets of relays with their associated load(s). As Applicant's representative discussed with Examiner Cavallari during the telephonic interview of June 20, 2006, drawing sheets 2 and 3 have been replaced to show greater detail of the connections between the first and second sets of relays and their respective load(s). Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the present objection is respectfully requested.

Serial No. 10/692,331

Docket No. 65783-0031

Informalities

The Examiner objected to claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 12, 13, 17, 18 & 20 because of informalities as described in the Office Action. Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 12, 13, 18 & 20 to recite "at least one first relay" and "at least one second relay" to more clearly point out that each may comprise one or more relays. Applicants have amended claim 17 to more clearly point out that a voltage generated by said primary power feed (1) is applied to the gate, and also (2) controls an operating state of said transistor. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the present objections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9, 11-16, and 20-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,127,741 ("Matsuda et al") in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0041473A1 ("Deguchi"). The Examiner also rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Matsuda in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0066168 A1 ("George et al"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants note that independent claim 1 recites "[a] control node power system providing power redundancy to certain devices of a vehicle, comprising... at least one first relay for selectively providing power to at least one device of a first class; and at least one second relay for selectively providing power to at least one device of a second class, said first and second class devices powered by a single node, wherein... upon disruption of said primary power feed, said at least one second class device is selectively powered by said secondary power feed by means of said second set of relays." Independent claim 12 recites "[a] power distribution node of a vehicle, comprising... at least one first relay for selectively distributing power from said primary power feed to at least one first class device of the vehicle; at least one second relay for selectively distributing power from one of said primary power feed and secondary power feed to at least one second class device of the vehicle, said first and second class devices powered by the node..." Independent claim 22 recites "[a] method of providing power to a vehicle device, comprising the steps of: selectively providing power to a plurality of vehicle devices by means of a power distribution control node, said plurality of vehicle devices comprising a first class of devices and a second class of devices, said power being derived from a primary power feed; isolating said first class of devices from said primary power feed upon an occurrence of a disruption in said primary power feed; and

Serial No. 10/692,331

Docket No. 65783-0031

selectively providing power to said first class of devices by means of said power distribution control node..." Independent claim 25 recites "[a] power distribution node, comprising... a first power distribution means...; a second power distribution means for distributing power from said first power feed to a second set of load devices and for distributing power from said second power feed to said second set of load devices, said first and second sets of load devices being connected to the node; a means for selectively isolating said second power distribution means from said first power feed; and a means for selectively connecting said second power distribution means to said second power feed." As such, the arrangements as presently claimed selectively preserve power to a particular group or groups of load devices, while isolating other group(s) of load devices that receive power from the same node.

It is respectfully submitted that the prior art of record neither teaches nor suggests the arrangement of independent claims 1, 12, 22, or 25. The device of Matsuda preserves power to a node of a vehicular power distribution apparatus, such that every load device attached to each node receive power as a single group. Applicants specifically point out that Matsuda discloses an apparatus for maintaining power to a plurality of power distribution nodes, and a single load or group of loads (23) connected to each power distribution node, when a failure occurs in a line transmitting power to the power distribution node. See Matsuda at Col. 3, lines 49-54; FIG. 1; and FIG. 2. Matsuda makes no mention of any ability to isolate various groups of load devices which are connected to a single power distribution node during a failure of a power source. Further, Matsuda teaches providing power loads (23) in a single group through power distribution node (5), such that the loads (23) are either all "on" or all "off." See Matsuda, FIG. 2. Matsuda therefore not only fails to disclose, but also teaches away from "...[a] first relay for selectively providing power to at least one device of a first class; and [a] second relay for selectively providing power to at least one device of a second class, said first and second class devices powered by a single node, wherein... upon disruption of said primary power feed, said at least one second class device is selectively powered by said secondary power feed by means of said second set of relays," as recited in claim 1, for example.

The other prior art of record fails to remedy the shortcomings of Matsuda. Neither Deguchi nor George teach selectively isolating one group of load devices while preserving power to other load devices connected to the same power distribution node as the first group of devices. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Matsuda with either

Serial No. 10/692,331

Docket No. 65783-0031

Deguchi or George neither discloses nor suggests the arrangement presently claimed. Further, claims 2-11, 13-21, and 23-24 depend from independent claims 1, 12, and 22, and are therefore believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as those stated above for claims 1, 12, and 22. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the present rejections are respectfully requested.

Conclusion


For at least these reasons, this application is now in condition for allowance. It is believed that any fees due with respect to this paper have already been identified in any transmittal accompanying this paper.

However, if any additional fees are required in connection with the filing of this paper that are not identified in any accompanying transmittal, permission is given to charge account number 18-0013 in the name of Rader, Fishman and Grauer PLLC, under order no. 65783-0031, from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments, he is kindly urged to call the undersigned to facilitate prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 22, 2006



Glenn E. Forbis

Registration No.: 40,610

Stefan D. Osterbur

Registration No.: 57,954

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

39533 Woodward Avenue, Suite 140

Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48304

(248) 594-0636

Attorneys for Applicant

Customer No. 010291